arXiv:1212.1903v1 [math-ph] 9 Dec 2012

SOME ABSTRACT WEGNER ESTIMATES WITH APPLICATIONS

MOSTAFA SABRI

Abstract. We prove some abstract Wegner bounds for random self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces. Applications include a new linear Wegner estimate for a discrete multi-particle Anderson model, as well as a non-linear Wegner bound for a quantum graph with random edge length in which the distribution of the random variables modelling the edge length do not necessarily have a density. Finally, we also give an elementary proof of a Wegner bound for continuous multi-particle Anderson Hamiltonians without a covering condition.

1. Introduction

Wegner estimates for random Schrödinger operators have been the subject of active research for the last three decades. The purpose of such estimates is to derive good bounds on the average number of eigenvalues of a random self-adjoint operator with a discrete spectrum in a fixed interval. Such estimates can be used in a proof of Anderson localization via multiscale analysis, or in the study of continuity properties of the integrated density of states.

The aim of this article is to derive some abstract Wegner bounds for some random self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space, and to apply them afterwards to obtain new estimates for specific models. While the abstract framework in Section 2 may seem a little dry, it proves to be rewarding as we will see in Section 3. Namely, it considerably shortens the proof of a Wegner bound for the model at hand (one just has to verify a list of hypotheses), and more importantly, it emphasizes the properties which are really essential for the proof. We hope the abstract theorems proved here will also find applications other than those mentioned in this paper.

The abstract Wegner estimates are stated in Section 2 and are then applied in Section 3. We first obtain linear Wegner estimates for discrete multi-particle Anderson models. For these models, we do not require the single-site potentials to cover all lattice points, but only need some uncertainty principle to hold in the interval. Such a principle holds trivially in any interval if all lattice points are covered by the single-site potential, and we show it also holds for intervals near the spectral edge of the unperturbed operator in the general case. Next, we treat a quantum graph with random edge lengths over $\mathbb{Z}^d$, without assuming the distribution of the random variables modelling the edge lengths has a density. The price to pay is that the Wegner bound is no longer linear. However, this allows us to extend the localization results of [11] to log-Hölder continuous distributions, in the case of a positive coupling constant (instead of distributions with a Lipschitz continuous density). Finally, we give an elementary proof of a non-linear Wegner bound for continuous multi-particle Anderson Hamiltonians with no covering condition, near the spectral edge of the unperturbed operator. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of the abstract theorems.

We end this section by discussing the limitations of this paper. We will usually assume the probability space has the form $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ for some index set $\mathcal{I}$. Each $\omega \in \Omega$ thus takes the form $\omega = (\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$. In some situations it will be important to have instead

---

Date: December 9, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 82B44. Secondary 47B80, 34B45.

Key words and phrases. Wegner estimates, random operators, multi-particle, quantum graphs.

$\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{I}}$, with some conditions on $q_-, q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$. All our Wegner bounds will essentially reproduce the modulus of continuity of $\mathbb{P}$. More precisely, we will bound the average number of eigenvalues in an interval of length $\varepsilon > 0$ by the uniform bound

$$s(\mathbb{P}, \varepsilon) = \sup_{\alpha} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{E \in \mathbb{R}} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{(\omega_\beta)_{\beta \neq \alpha}} \mathbb{P}\left\{\omega_\alpha \in [E, E+\varepsilon] \big| (\omega_\beta)_{\beta \neq \alpha}\right\}, \tag{1-1}$$

multiplied by some other terms. The term $s(\mathbb{P}, \varepsilon)$ is defined via conditional probabilities and might seem complicated. However, in most applications one has $\mathbb{P} = \bigotimes_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}} \mu$, where μ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. In this case, (1-1) reduces to

$$s(\mu, \varepsilon) = \sup\{\mu[a, b] : b - a \leq \varepsilon\}. \tag{1-2}$$

We will not make any regularity assumptions on $\mathbb{P}$. However, our bounds are only useful if the probability measure is continuous. A log-Hölder continuity with a sufficiently large exponent will generally be sufficient for localization purposes. On the other hand, if the measure is discrete, our bounds are useless. For example, if μ is the Bernoulli measure $\mu = p\delta_0 + (1-p)\delta_1$, then $s(\mu, \varepsilon) \geq p$ no matter how small ε is. So the thirty years old problem of deriving a Wegner bound for the Bernoulli-Anderson model on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ with $d > 1$ remains open.

A more accessible model which we cannot treat here is the random Schrödinger operator with sign-changing single-site potential. A Wegner bound for such models without assuming the distribution μ of the random variables modelling the disorder has a density remains, to the best of our knowledge, an open problem (at least in the continuum). If μ has a density, some Wegner estimates have been established for such models; see [10], [7], [21], [22] and [13].

2. Abstract Theorems

We start by recalling the definition of a random self-adjoint operator on a Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable complex Hilbert space and denote by $L(\mathcal{H})$ the set of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Let $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. A mapping $B : \Omega \to L(\mathcal{H})$ is called *measurable* if for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, the mapping

$$\Omega \ni \omega \mapsto \langle B(\omega)x, y\rangle \in \mathbb{C}$$

is measurable. Now let $S(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of self-adjoint operators on $\mathcal{H}$. We say that $H : \Omega \to S(\mathcal{H})$ is a *random self-adjoint operator* if for all bounded measurable functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$, the mapping $\omega \mapsto f(H(\omega))$ is measurable. The reader may find equivalent formulations in [18, Section 1.2] and [3, Chapter V]. Note that we do not need ergodicity in this paper.

We now state our abstract results. Before we begin, let us stress that the following Hypotheses (A) to (C) are mutually independent, and do not follow a specific order of generality. Hypotheses (A) and (B) will be applied to obtain linear Wegner estimates, while Hypotheses (C) yield non-linear ones.

Let us start with the simplest case, namely a finite dimensional Hilbert space. We chose to single out this case, first because the proofs are different, and second because they give a better upper bound.

2.1. **Hypotheses (A).**

1) $H(\omega)$ is a random self-adjoint operator on a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We fix an orthonormal basis $\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$ for $\mathcal{H}$; in particular $\dim \mathcal{H} = |J|$.
2) There exists an interval $I = [E_1, E_2]$, a constant $\gamma > 0$ (which may depend on I) and a self-adjoint operator W of the form

$$W = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}} U_\alpha,$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is an index set and U_α are self-adjoint operators, such that $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely,

$$\chi_I(H(\omega))W\chi_I(H(\omega)) \geq \gamma\chi_I(H(\omega)).$$

Here $\chi_I(H(\omega))$ is the spectral projection of $H(\omega)$ onto the interval I.

3) We define $\mathcal{I}_j := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{I} : U_\alpha e_j \neq 0\}$ and assume $C_{\text{fin}} := \max_{j\in J} |\mathcal{I}_j| < \infty$.

Note that one may take $W = \sum_j P_j = Id$, where $P_j f := \langle f, e_j\rangle e_j$, in which case conditions 2 and 3 hold trivially on any interval with $\gamma = 1$ and $C_{\text{fin}} = 1$. Condition 2 is called an uncertainty principle, and an efficient criterion to check its validity was established in [2, Theorem 1.1]. For random Schrödinger operators, W can be the sum of the single site potentials U_α.

The following proposition is the key idea for obtaining linear Wegner bounds without covering assumptions using spectral averaging (cf. Section 4). It decomposes the trace into local contributions of the operators U_α. To prove it, we abstract some ideas of [19]. The proof greatly simplifies here due to the finite dimensionality[1].

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that $H(\omega)$ satisfies Hypotheses (A) in the interval $I = [E_1, E_2]$. Then*

$$\operatorname{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))] \leq \gamma^{-2} C_{\text{fin}} \sum_{j\in J} \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}_j} \langle U_\alpha \chi_I(H(\omega)) U_\alpha e_j, e_j\rangle.$$

To state our first linear Wegner estimate, we start with some additional hypotheses.

2.2. Hypotheses (B).

1) The probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ has the form $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ or the form $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{I}}$ for some $q_- < q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$. We define $s(\mathbb{P}, \varepsilon)$ as in (1-1).
2) $H(\omega)$ has the form

$$H(\omega) = H_1 + V_\omega,$$

where H_1 is self adjoint, and given $\omega = (\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} \in \Omega$,

$$V_\omega := \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} \omega_\alpha U_\alpha,$$

where $U_\alpha \geq 0$ and $\|U_\alpha\| \leq C_U$ for all α.

The second hypothesis is a serious restriction: randomness must appear as an additive perturbation of the operator H_1. This restriction is necessary for the next theorem because the proof relies on spectral averaging.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $H(\omega)$ satisfies Hypotheses (A) and (B) in the interval $I = [E_1, E_2]$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\{\operatorname{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} \leq C_W \cdot |J| \cdot s(\mathbb{P}, |I|),$$

where

$$C_W := 6\gamma^{-2} C_U^2 C_{\text{fin}}^2.$$

Despite the restrictive Hypotheses (B), this theorem is still efficient for discrete Schrödinger operators on $\ell^2(\Gamma)$, where Γ is a locally finite graph (e.g. $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$). It can for example treat the case of multi-particle potentials without a covering condition in certain energy intervals. However, by hypothesis all $U_\alpha \geq 0$, so it cannot treat models with sign-changing single site potentials.

We now move to separable Hilbert spaces. In the following, we say that a map $f : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is monotone increasing (resp. monotone decreasing) if $\omega_\alpha^{(1)} \leq \omega_\alpha^{(2)}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$ implies $f(\omega^{(1)}) \leq f(\omega^{(2)})$ (resp. $f(\omega^{(1)}) \geq f(\omega^{(2)})$).

---

[1] In particular, we can easily avoid the inequality in [19] which remains unjustified; see [20].

2.3. **Hypotheses (C).**

1) $H(\omega)$ is a random self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.
2) $H(\omega)$ is bounded below and has an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors.
3) The probability space Ω has the form $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ or the form $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{I}}$ for some $q_- < q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$. Here $\mathcal{I}$ is a finite index set. We define $s(\mathbb{P}, \varepsilon)$ as in (1-1).
4) Fix an interval I and an ordering of the eigenvalues $\lambda_n(\omega)$ of $H(\omega)$ counting multiplicity. Then there exists a number K independent of ω such that
$$n > K \implies \lambda_n(\omega) \notin I.$$
5) The domain $\mathcal{D}$ of $H(\omega)$ is independent of ω.
6) Denote $\mathbf{1} := (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$. There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for every $u \in \mathcal{D}$, the map
$$f_u(\omega) := \langle H(\omega)u, u\rangle$$
verifies one of the following properties for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $t \geq 0$ such that $\omega - t\cdot\mathbf{1} \in \Omega$:
   a. f_u is monotone increasing and $f_u(\omega) - f_u(\omega - t \cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq t\gamma\|u\|^2$.
   b. f_u is monotone increasing, continuously differentiable and $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} \frac{\partial f_u(\omega)}{\partial\omega_\alpha} \geq \gamma\|u\|^2$.
   c. f_u is monotone decreasing and $f_u(\omega) - f_u(\omega - t \cdot \mathbf{1}) \leq -t\gamma\|u\|^2$.
   d. f_u is monotone decreasing, continuously differentiable and $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} \frac{\partial f_u(\omega)}{\partial\omega_\alpha} \leq -\gamma\|u\|^2$.

The second condition can actually be relaxed; we could ask $H(\omega)$ to have a discrete spectrum in I instead of an orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions. However, in this case, using the same proof (except for the first step) we can instead bound $\mathbb{P}\{\sigma(H(\omega)) \cap I \neq \emptyset\}$ by the same upper bound stated in Theorem 2.3, which is of course weaker but still useful. The fourth condition may be seen as a weak Weyl law. It is satisfied for example if $\mathcal{H}$ is finite dimensional, in which case $K = \dim\mathcal{H}$. Indeed, since the total number of eigenvalues in this case is K, the condition is trivially verified (since there is no eigenvalue with $n > K$). For infinite dimensional spaces, this condition is satisfied if $H(\omega)$ is bounded below by a (non random) operator H_0 with a compact resolvent. So the only “real” conditions are 5 and 6. Condition 6 assumes monotonicity and “diagonal covering” for $H(\omega)$. We relax the latter condition in Theorem 2.4.

Note that we allow infinite dimensional spaces and do not assume that $H(\omega)$ has the specific form $H(\omega) = H_1 + V_\omega$. This provides a great wealth of random operators, both inside and outside the realm of Schrödinger operators, which cannot be treated by Theorem 2.2, and to which a Wegner estimate holds as in the next theorem. In particular, Hypotheses (C).6.b and (C).6.d are well suited for models in which $H(\omega) - H(\omega - t \cdot \mathbf{1})$ depends non-linearly on ω. Such models are not just mathematical curiosities; they arise very naturally when studying quantum graphs with random edge lengths for example. Let us state the theorem:

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose $H(\omega)$ satisfies Hypotheses (C) in the interval $I = (E_1, E_2)$. Then*
$$\mathbb{E}\{\operatorname{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} \leq K \cdot |\mathcal{I}| \cdot s\Big(\mathbb{P}, \frac{|I|}{\gamma}\Big).$$

In applications to random Schrödinger operators defined on cubes Λ, the constant K comes from a Weyl law and takes the form $C(E_2, q_-) \cdot |\Lambda|$. So the “bad” term in this estimate is $|\mathcal{I}|$. For single-particle models, this term is equal to $|\Lambda|$, so the upper bound in not linear in $|\Lambda|$.

There are mainly two applications for Wegner estimates: the first to prove localization via multiscale analysis, the second to study continuity properties of the integrated density of states (IDS) of $H(\omega)$. For the first purpose, Theorem 2.3 is satisfactory because the term $s(\mathbb{P}, |I|)$ will be sub-exponentially small assuming all $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|(\omega_\beta)_{\beta\neq\alpha})$ are Hölder continuous, so it will completely outweight the terms K and $|\mathcal{I}|$. This is also true in the more general situation of log-Hölder continuity with a sufficiently large parameter. For the study of the IDS however, this theorem is not satisfactory, and it might be the price to pay for Hypotheses (C).

The term $|\mathcal{I}|$ emerges because our proof of Theorem 2.3 uses Stollmann's Lemma (cf. [18, Lemma 2.3.1]) to control the eigenvalues of $H(\omega)$. Let us speculate a little how one could avoid the term $|\mathcal{I}|$ or at least make it smaller. The first road would be to provide more specific input to Stollmann's Lemma, based on some specific information on the eigenvalues, to obtain a better bound. The second road would be to first "work out" the trace of $\chi_I(H(\omega))$ a little, in the spirit of Proposition 2.1. Indeed, if one can in some sort divide the trace into a sum of local contributions of subspaces $\mathcal{H}_j$ in a setting to which Stollmann's Lemma is applicable, then the eigenvalues of $H(\omega)$ restricted to $\mathcal{H}_j$ would only depend on the ω_α with α in a smaller set $\mathcal{I}_j \subset \mathcal{I}$ so the term $|\mathcal{I}|$ would reduce to $\max_j |\mathcal{I}_j|$, which would indeed make the estimate linear in the volume.

Our linear Wegner estimate has yet another advantage, namely it suffices to know the behavior of $H(\omega)$ in the interval I to deduce a Wegner bound in I. This is encoded in the uncertainty principle, and it is the reason why it can treat some models without a covering condition. As we show in Section 4, there is a related counterpart of this idea for Theorem 2.3. Namely, if one can prove that the eigenvalues $\lambda_n(\omega)$ of $H(\omega)$ are monotone increasing and satisfy

$$\big(\lambda_n(\omega) - \lambda_n(\omega - t\cdot\mathbf{1})\big)\chi_I(\lambda_n(\omega)) \geq t\gamma \cdot \chi_I(\lambda_n(\omega)),$$

then Theorem 2.3 is still valid if we only assume Hypotheses (C).1 to (C).4. We illustrate this idea in the next theorem, which finds applications in continuous Anderson Hamiltonians without a covering condition.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $H(\omega)$ be a random self-adjoint operator satisfying Hypotheses (C).1 to (C).5. Assume moreover that Ω has the form $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathcal{I}}$, where $q_+ > q_- > 0$ and $\mathcal{I}$ is a finite index set, and that $\mathbb{P} = \otimes_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}}\mu_\alpha$ for some probability measures μ_α on $\mathbb{R}$ supported on $[q_-, q_+]$. Suppose there exists $\zeta \neq 0$ such that for any $u \in \mathcal{D}$,*

$$\langle H(\omega)u, u\rangle = -a(u) + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} \omega_\alpha^\zeta b_\alpha(u) \tag{2-1}$$

for some constants $a(u) \geq 0$ and $b_\alpha(u) \geq 0$. Then for any open interval $I = (E_1, E_2)$ with $E_1 > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} \leq K \cdot |\mathcal{I}| \cdot \max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} s\left(\mu_\alpha, q_+\Big((1 + \frac{|I|}{E_1})^{\frac{1}{|\zeta|}} - 1\Big)\right).$$

In particular, if $\zeta = \pm 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} \leq K \cdot |\mathcal{I}| \cdot \max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} s\Big(\mu_\alpha, \frac{q_+}{E_1}|I|\Big).$$

Of course the main advantage here in comparison with Theorem 2.3 is that we suppose nothing on the $b_\alpha(u)$ except that $b_\alpha(u) \geq 0$. Theorem 2.3 would need a condition of the type $\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} b_\alpha(u) \geq \gamma\|u\|^2 > 0$ for all u. The price to pay is that we need the specific form (2-1).

In the applications we shall only need the case $\zeta = 1$. However the greater generality does not require additional effort here, and we believe it could be useful for models not considered in this paper. For example, the case where $\zeta = -2$ appears in the model studied in [15] (there is an additional difficulty in that model however, namely the domain $D(H(\omega))$ depends on ω, so that Hypothesis (C).5 is not satisfied).

3. APPLICATIONS

3.1. **Discrete Multi-particle models.** As a first application for the above theorems, we obtain linear Wegner estimates for discrete multi-particle Anderson models. To the best of our knowledge, this result is new, since we assume neither that the random variables have a density, nor that the single-site potentials cover the lattice. For previous linear bounds, see [9] for the lattice and [12] for the continuum. The reader who is not familiar with multi-particle systems may assume that $n = 1$; we believe the estimate and the proof are still interesting in this case.

Consider the Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{nd})$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ represents the number of particles living in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, a probability space $(\Omega, \mathbb{P})$, where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ or $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ for some $q_- < q_+ \in \mathbb{R}$, and given $\omega = (\omega_\alpha) \in \Omega$, the Hamiltonian

$$H(\omega) = H_0 + V_0 + V^\omega$$

where H_0 is the discrete Laplace operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^{nd})$, V_0 is a real non-random interaction potential and for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^n \equiv \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$, $V^\omega(\mathbf{x})$ is given by

$$V^\omega(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} V^\omega(x_i) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega_\alpha u_\alpha(x_i).$$

We assume V_0 is bounded and the u_α satisfy

$$0 \le u_\alpha \le C_u$$

for some uniform bound $C_u \ge 0$. We also assume the u_α are compactly supported, that is, if for $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the cubes

$$\Lambda_L^{(1)}(j) := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \|x - j\|_\infty \le L\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{j}) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd} : \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{j}\|_\infty \le L\},$$

then we assume there exists an $R \ge 0$ such that $u_\alpha(j) = 0$ for all $j \notin \Lambda_R^{(1)}(\alpha)$.

A very simple example to keep in mind is when $n = 1$ and

$$H(\omega) = H_0 + \sum_{j \in D} \omega_j \delta_j,$$

where $D \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ is an arbitrary non-empty set. For instance one may take $D = \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$, in which case the random potential does not cover the site 0, so that the elementary proofs of Wegner estimates fail for this model (because $W := \sum_{j \in D} \delta_j$ does not verify $W \ge \gamma$ for some $\gamma > 0$)

To state our Wegner bound, note that we may interchange the sums (since $\operatorname{supp} u_\alpha$ is compact) and write

$$V^\omega = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega_\alpha U_\alpha,$$

with

$$U_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} u_\alpha(x_i).$$

Now put $W = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d} U_\alpha$, let $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$ be a cube and let $H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\omega)$ be a self-adjoint restriction of $H(\omega)$ to $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ (obtained by imposing some boundary conditions). Take $\mathcal{H} := \ell^2\big(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})\big)$. The following theorem tells us that an uncertainty principle in I implies a Wegner bound in I. After proving it, we give in Lemma 3.2 some concrete situations in which the uncertainty principle holds.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that in an interval I, the operator $H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})}(\omega)$ satisfies*

$$\chi_I(H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})}(\omega)) W \chi_I(H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})}(\omega)) \ge \gamma \chi_I(H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})}(\omega)) \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{3-1}$$

for some $\gamma > 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\{\operatorname{tr}[\chi_I(H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})}(\omega))]\} \le C_W \cdot \big|\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})\big| \cdot s(\mathbb{P}, |I|),$$

where

$$C_W = 6n^4\gamma^{-2}C_u^2(2R+1)^{2d}.$$

Note that if $u_\alpha = c_\alpha\delta_\alpha$ with $c_\alpha \geq 0$, we may take $R = 0$.

Proof. Given $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^n$ and $S \in \mathbb{N}$, put $\Pi\Lambda_S^{(n)}(\mathbf{y}) := \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_S^{(1)}(y_i)$. Note that $H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\omega)$ takes the form

$$H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\omega) = H_1 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})} \omega_\alpha U_\alpha$$

with $H_1 = H_{0,\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})} + V_{0,\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}$ self-adjoint. Since $\dim\mathcal{H} = |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})|$, Hypotheses (A) and (B) are verified with $C_U \leq nC_u$ and $C_{\text{fin}} = \max_{\mathbf{j}\in\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})} |\Pi\Lambda_R^{(n)}(\mathbf{j})| \leq n(2R+1)^d$. The claim now follows from Theorem 2.2. □

Lemma 3.2. *The uncertainty principle (3-1) holds*

(1) *in any interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ if $u_\alpha \geq c\cdot\delta_\alpha$ for some $c > 0$ and all α, with $\gamma = nc$.*

(2) *in any interval $I \subset (-\infty, E_0 - \eta]$, for $E_0 = \inf\sigma(H_0 + V_0)$ and any $\eta > 0$, if Ω has the form $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $q_- < q_+ \leq 0$, for the Dirichlet restriction $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{x})}$ with $\gamma \geq \frac{\eta}{|q_-|}$.*

(3) *in any interval $I \subset (-\infty, E_F - \eta]$, for $E_F = \inf\sigma(H_0 + V_0 + q_+W)$ and any $\eta > 0$, if Ω has the form $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $0 \leq q_- < q_+$, for the Dirichlet restriction with $\gamma \geq \frac{\eta}{q_+ - q_-}$.*

Theorem 3.1 combined with Lemma 3.2 thus provide a Wegner bound in any of the three above situations. We further comment on the result after proving the lemma.

Proof. For the first assertion, note that if $u_\alpha \geq c\cdot\delta_\alpha$, then for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{nd}$,

$$W(\mathbf{x}) \geq c \sum_{1\leq i\leq n}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_\alpha(x_i) = c\sum_{1\leq i\leq n} 1 = nc,$$

so that $W \geq nc$ and the uncertainty principle holds trivially in any interval with $\gamma = nc$.

For the second, given $\omega \in \Omega$, let $\lambda_\omega(t) := \inf\sigma(H^D_\Lambda(\omega) + tW_\Lambda)$. Then for any $t \geq -q_-$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_\omega(t) &= \inf\sigma\Big(H^D_{0,\Lambda} + V_{0,\Lambda} + \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})} (\omega_\alpha + t)U_\alpha\Big)\\ &\geq \inf\sigma\Big(H_0 + V_0 + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^d}(\omega_\alpha + t)U_\alpha\Big) \geq E_0\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that Dirichlet boundary conditions shift the spectrum up (see [8, Section 5.2]). Thus, if $I \subset (-\infty, E_0 - \eta]$, we get $\lambda_\omega(-q_-) - \max I \geq \eta$. By [2, Theorem 1.1], an uncertainty principle thus holds in I with $\gamma \geq \frac{\eta}{-q_-}$, which proves the claim. For the last assertion, note that $H(\omega) = H_F + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^d}(\omega_\alpha - q_+)U_\alpha$, where $H_F = H_0 + V_0 + q_+W$, so the claim is similar to the second assertion. □

Note that a Wegner bound in the situation (2) of the lemma is not a trivial result since $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\omega)$ has some spectrum below E_0 if q_+ is sufficiently negative. Indeed, we have for any $\mathbf{j} \in \Lambda := \Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$,

$$\langle H^D_\Lambda\delta_{\mathbf{j}}, \delta_{\mathbf{j}}\rangle = \langle (H^D_{0,\Lambda} + V_{0,\Lambda})\delta_{\mathbf{j}}, \delta_{\mathbf{j}}\rangle + \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi\Lambda_R^{(n)}(\mathbf{j})} \omega_\alpha\langle U_\alpha\delta_{\mathbf{j}}, \delta_{\mathbf{j}}\rangle.$$

Hence if $\Pi\Lambda$ is large enough to contain an α such that the corresponding U_α is nonzero, and if q_- and q_+ are sufficiently negative, this yields a value below E_0.

The first situation (1) where a covering condition holds, improves the result of [9] and the one-volume bound of [5]. If $\mathbb{P} = \otimes_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\mu_\alpha$ for some probability measures μ_α on $\mathbb{R}$, the two-volume bound may be deduced as in [17, Theorem 6.3].

3.2. **Quantum graphs with random edge length.** In this section we prove a Wegner bound for a quantum graph with random edge length over $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For this, we first rely on the analysis of [11], then make use of Theorem 2.3.

Let $(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{V})$ be the metric graph with vertex set $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and edge set $\mathcal{E} = \{(m, m+h_j), m \in \mathbb{Z}^d, j = 1,\dots,d\}$, where $(h_j)_{j=1}^d$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Each edge $e = (v, v')$ thus has an initial vertex $\iota e = v$ and a terminal vertex $\tau e = v'$. Each e is then identified with the interval $[0, l_e]$, where $0 < l_{\min} \le l_e \le l_{\max} < \infty$. This gives a sequence of lengths $l = (l_e)$. Now fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := \oplus_{e\in\mathcal{E}} L^2[0, l_e]$ and the operator

$$H(l,\alpha)(f_e) = (-f_e''),$$

$$D(H(l,\alpha)) := \left\{ (f_e) \in \bigoplus_{e\in\mathcal{E}} W^{2,2}(0,l_e) \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} f_e(l_e) = f_b(0) := f(v) \text{ for } \tau e = \iota b = v, \\ f'(v) = \alpha f(v) \text{ for each } v \in \mathcal{V} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Here $f'(v) := \sum_{e:\iota e = v} f_e'(0) - \sum_{e:\tau e = v} f_e'(l_e)$. $H(l,\alpha)$ is then self-adjoint (see [14]). Finally let μ_e be probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ with support $[l_{\min}, l_{\max}]$ and consider the probability space $(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$, where $\Omega := [l_{\min}, l_{\max}]^{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\mathbb{P} := \otimes_{e\in\mathcal{E}}\mu_e$. Then for $l^\omega = (l_e^\omega) \in \Omega$, the random Schrödinger operator we study is $H^\omega(\alpha) := H(l^\omega,\alpha)$.

For a finite subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{E}$, denote $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda := \{\iota e : e \in \Lambda\} \cup \{\tau e : e \in \Lambda\}$. This yields a graph $(\Lambda, \mathcal{V}_\Lambda)$ and a corresponding operator $H_\Lambda(l^\omega,\alpha)$ which we denote by $H_\Lambda^\omega(\alpha) := H_\Lambda(l^\omega,\alpha)$ and call the Hamiltonian restricted to Λ.

Given $L \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the cube

$$\Lambda_L = \{e \in \mathcal{E} : \|\iota e\|_\infty \le L \text{ or } \|\tau e\|_\infty \le L\}$$

and the set

$$\Delta = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \left[\frac{\pi^2 k^2}{l_{\max}^2}, \frac{\pi^2 k^2}{l_{\min}^2}\right].$$

Then we have the following Wegner bound.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $I \subset (0,\infty)$ be an interval such that $\bar{I} \cap \Delta = \emptyset$. Then there exists $c_1 = c_1(d)$ and $c_2 = c_2(I) > 0$ such that for any interval $J \subset I$ and any cube Λ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\sigma(H_\Lambda^\omega(\alpha)) \cap J \neq \emptyset\} \le c_1 \cdot |\Lambda|^2 \cdot \max_{e\in\Lambda} s\big(\mu_e, c_2|J|\big),$$

where $|\Lambda|$ denotes the number of edges in Λ.

The main advantage here is that we make no regularity assumptions on μ_e. This is in contrast to [11], where it is assumed that μ_e has a density which is Lipschitz continuous. As a consequence, Theorem 3.3 extends the localization results of [11] to distributions μ_e which are (log-)Hölder continuous, provided the coupling constant $\alpha > 0$. There is a price to pay, namely the Wegner estimate is no longer linear in the volume.

Proof. As in [11], we first reduce the Wegner bound for the operator $H_\Lambda^\omega(\alpha)$ on $L^2(\Lambda)$ to a Wegner bound for a related discrete operator $M_\Lambda(l^\omega, J)$ on $\ell^2(\mathcal{V}_\Lambda)$.

Given $e \in \Lambda$, let P_1^e, P_2^e and I^e be the operators on $\ell^2(\mathcal{V}_\Lambda)$ given by

$$P_1^e f(v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(f(\iota e) + f(\tau e)) & \text{if } v \in \{\iota e, \tau e\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$P_2^e f(v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(f(\iota e) - f(\tau e)) & \text{if } v = \iota e, \\ \frac{1}{2}(f(\tau e) - f(\iota e)) & \text{if } v = \tau e, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$I^e f(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) & \text{if } v \in \{\iota e, \tau e\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now given $J \subset I$, let $E = E_J$ be the midpoint of J and consider the operator

$$M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E) = \sum_{e \in \Lambda} \Big(\frac{\sqrt{E}}{\sin l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}} (P_1^e - P_2^e) - \sqrt{E} \cot l_e^\omega \sqrt{E} I^e \Big).$$

Then it is proved in [11, Eq.(10)] that there exists $b > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\sigma(H_\Lambda^\omega(\alpha)) \cap J \neq \emptyset\} \leq \mathbb{P}\big\{ \operatorname{dist}\big(\sigma(M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)), \alpha\big) \leq b|J| \big\}.$$

Let us stress that this inequality is obtained by spectral analytic arguments, without any assumptions on the regularity of the probability distribution. It follows from a general relationship between the spectra of H_Λ^ω and its discrete analog $M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)$.

Since $M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)$ only depends on l_e^ω with $e \in \Lambda$, the relevant probability space here is $\Omega = [l_{\min}, l_{\max}]^\Lambda$ and $\mathbb{P} = \otimes_{e \in \Lambda} \mu_e$. Now

$$\frac{\partial M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)}{\partial l_e^\omega} = -\frac{E \cos l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}}{\sin^2 l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}} (P_1^e - P_2^e) + \frac{E}{\sin^2 l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}} I^e.$$

Since $\|P_1^e - P_2^e\| = 1$ and $P_j^e I^e = P_j^e$, we have

$$-\cos l_e^\omega \sqrt{E} (P_1^e - P_2^e) + I^e \geq \big(1 - |\cos l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}|\big) I^e.$$

As $\bar{I} \cap \Delta = \emptyset$, there exists β_1 and $\beta_2 > 0$ such that

$$1 - |\cos l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}| \geq \beta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{E}{\sin^2 l_e^\omega \sqrt{E}} \geq \beta_2$$

for all $e \in \Lambda$. Hence

$$\frac{\partial M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)}{\partial l_e^\omega} \geq \beta_1 \beta_2 I^e \qquad \text{for all } e \in \Lambda, \tag{3-2}$$

so that

$$\sum_{e \in \Lambda} \frac{\partial M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)}{\partial l_e^\omega} \geq \beta_1 \beta_2 \sum_{e \in \Lambda} I^e \geq \beta \cdot Id$$

for $\beta = \beta_1 \beta_2 > 0$. Thus, given $u \in \ell^2(\mathcal{V}_\Lambda)$, if we put $f_u(l^\omega) := \langle M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E) u, u \rangle$ we get

$$\sum_{e \in \Lambda} \frac{\partial f_u(l^\omega)}{\partial l_e^\omega} = \Big\langle \sum_{e \in \Lambda} \frac{\partial M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)}{\partial l_e^\omega} u, u \Big\rangle \geq \beta \|u\|^2.$$

Finally f_u is monotone increasing (this follows from (3-2)) and since $\ell^2(\mathcal{V}_\Lambda)$ is finite dimensional, the rest of Hypotheses (C) are clearly verified with $\mathcal{I} = \Lambda$ and $K = |\mathcal{V}_\Lambda| \leq c_d |\Lambda|$. We may thus apply Theorem 2.3 and Markov inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\big\{ \operatorname{dist}\big(\sigma(M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)), \alpha\big) \leq b|J| \big\} &= \mathbb{P}\big\{ \operatorname{tr} \chi_{[\alpha - b|J|, \alpha + b|J|]}(M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E)) \geq 1 \big\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\{\operatorname{tr} \chi_{[\alpha - b|J|, \alpha + b|J|]}(M_\Lambda(l^\omega, E))\} \\ &\leq c_d |\Lambda|^2 \max_e s\Big(\mu_e, \frac{2b}{\beta}|J|\Big). \end{aligned}$$

□

3.3. **Non-Covering Potentials.** In this subsection, we apply Theorem 2.4 to derive Wegner bounds for continuous multi-particle Hamiltonians without a covering condition. Of course Theorem 2.4 can also be applied to discrete ones, but in this case Theorem 3.1 combined with Lemma 3.2 give a better bound.

For single-particle models, there are already the results of [6] and [2], and they obtain a better bound (since it is optimal in the volume). Furthermore, P. Hislop announced in May 2012 a work in progress with F. Klopp in which an optimal Wegner estimate is derived for non-covering multi-particle Hamiltonians. However, we believe that our result is still interesting, first because our proof is very elementary (the analysis in [6] is technically involved, and the proof in [2] builds on the results of [6]), second because it is sufficient for localization purposes.

Consider the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{nd})$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ represents the number of particles living in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and a probability space $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $q_+ > q_- > 0$, $\mathbb{P} = \otimes_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mu_\alpha$ for some probability measures μ_α on $\mathbb{R}$ supported on $[q_-, q_+]$. Given $\omega = (\omega_\alpha) \in \Omega$, consider the Hamiltonian

$$H(\omega) = -\Delta + V_0 - V^\omega,$$

where V_0 is an interaction potential bounded below and for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n \equiv \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, $V^\omega(\mathbf{x})$ is given by

$$V^\omega(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} V^\omega(x_i) = \sum_{1 \le i \le n} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \omega_\alpha u_\alpha(x_i).$$

We assume the u_α satisfy

$$0 \le u_\alpha \le C_u$$

for some uniform bound $C_u > 0$, and that u_α are compactly supported, with $\operatorname{supp} u_\alpha \subset \Lambda_R^{(1)}(\alpha)$ for some $R > 0$ and all α. Given $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ and a cube $\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nd}$, let $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})}(\omega)$ be the Dirichlet restriction of $H(\omega)$ acting on $\mathcal{H} := L^2\big(\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})\big)$. Then we have the following Wegner bound.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $E_0 = \inf \sigma(-\Delta + V_0)$ and let $I = (E_1, E_2)$ be an open interval with $E_2 < E_0$. Then there exists $C_W = C_W(n, d, E_0 - E_2, q_-, C_u)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\{\operatorname{tr}[\chi_I(H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})})]\} \le C_W \cdot |\Lambda_L^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot |\Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot \max_{\alpha \in \Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})} s\Big(\mu_\alpha, \frac{q_+}{E_0 - E_2}|I|\Big),$$

where $\Pi\Lambda_S^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) := \Big(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \Lambda_S^{(1)}(x_j)\Big) \bigcap \mathbb{Z}^d$ for $S \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note that this result is not trivial because $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega)$ may have some spectrum below E_0, since the random perturbation $-V^\omega$ is negative. This depends on the u_α, and is related to the concept of weak fluctuation boundaries; see [2].

Proof. We omit the center $\mathbf{x}$ from the notation. Since $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega)$ only depends on the ω_α with $\alpha \in \Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}$, the relevant probability space here is $\Omega = [q_-, q_+]^{\Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}}$ and $\mathbb{P} = \otimes_{\alpha \in \Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}} \mu_\alpha$. Write $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega)$ in the form $H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega) = H_1 - \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}} \omega_\alpha U_\alpha$, where $H_1 := -\Delta^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}} + V_{0,\Lambda_L^{(n)}}$ and $U_\alpha(y_1, \ldots, y_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n u_\alpha(y_i)$. Now put $G(\omega) = -H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega) + E_0$ and $I' = (-E_2 + E_0, -E_1 + E_0)$. Then $G(\omega)$ satisfies Hypotheses (C).1 to (C).5. in I', with $K = C|\Lambda_L^{(n)}|$ coming from a Weyl law. Furthermore, for $f \in D(H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}})$,

$$\langle G(\omega)f, f\rangle = -\langle (H_1 - E_0)f, f\rangle + \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi\Lambda_{L+R}^{(n)}} \omega_\alpha \langle U_\alpha f, f\rangle.$$

Since Dirichlet boundary conditions shift the spectrum up, we have $(H_1 - E_0) \geq 0$. Since $U_\alpha \geq 0$, we thus see that $G(\omega)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 on the interval I'. Finally, $\lambda_n(G(\omega)) = -\lambda_n(H_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega)) + E_0$ for all eigenvalues λ_n, hence $\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H^D_{\Lambda_L^{(n)}}(\omega))]\} = \mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_{I'}(G(\omega))]\}$. We thus get the assertion by Theorem 2.4. □

Note that a similar bound holds true in the case of positive perturbations. More precisely, if $H(\omega) = -\Delta + V_0 + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \omega_\alpha U_\alpha$, where $\omega \in [q_-, q_+]^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is as above with $q_+ > q_- > 0$, then taking $W := \sum_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Z}^d} U_\alpha$, we get a Wegner bound in any open interval I such that $\bar{I} \subset (-\infty, E_F)$, where $E_F = \inf \sigma(H_0 + V_0 + q_+ W)$. This follows as before, since this operator may be regarded as a negative perturbation of $H_F = H_0 + V_0 + q_+ W$.

4. PROOFS OF THE GENERAL THEOREMS

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Put $\chi_I := \chi_I(H(\omega))$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is finite dimensional, any linear operator is trace class. Now by hypothesis

$$\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I] \leq \gamma^{-1}\,\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I W \chi_I].$$

Recall that for two Hilbert-Schmidt operators A and B we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}[B^*A] &= \langle A, B\rangle_{HS} \leq \|A\|_{HS}\|B\|_{HS}\\ &\leq \frac{c}{2}\|A\|^2_{HS} + \frac{1}{2c}\|B\|^2_{HS} = \frac{c}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}[A^*A] + \frac{1}{2c}\,\mathrm{tr}[B^*B]\end{aligned}$$

for any $c > 0$. Applying this to $B^* = \chi_I W \chi_I$, $A = \chi_I$ and $c = \gamma$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I] &\leq \gamma^{-1}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I] + \frac{1}{2\gamma}\,\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I W \chi_I W \chi_I]\Big)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I] + \frac{1}{2\gamma^2}\,\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I W \chi_I W \chi_I],\end{aligned}$$

hence,

$$\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I] \leq \gamma^{-2}\,\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I W \chi_I W \chi_I].$$

Since $W\chi_I W \geq 0$, we have $\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I W \chi_I W \chi_I] \leq \|\chi_I\|\|W\chi_I W\|_1\|\chi_I\| = \mathrm{tr}[W\chi_I W]$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I] &\leq \gamma^{-2}\,\mathrm{tr}[W\chi_I W]\\ &= \gamma^{-2}\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{\alpha,\alpha'\in\mathcal{I}} \langle U_\alpha \chi_I U_{\alpha'} e_j, e_j\rangle\\ &= \gamma^{-2}\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{\alpha,\alpha'\in\mathcal{I}_j} \langle \chi_I U_{\alpha'} e_j, \chi_I U_\alpha e_j\rangle\\ &\leq \frac{\gamma^{-2}}{2}\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{\alpha,\alpha'\in\mathcal{I}_j} \big(\|\chi_I U_{\alpha'} e_j\|^2 + \|\chi_I U_\alpha e_j\|^2\big)\\ &\leq \gamma^{-2} C_{\mathrm{fin}}\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}_j} \|\chi_I U_\alpha e_j\|^2\\ &= \gamma^{-2} C_{\mathrm{fin}}\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}_j} \langle U_\alpha \chi_I U_\alpha e_j, e_j\rangle\end{aligned}$$

which proves the assertion. □

To prove Theorem 2.2, we first recall the following spectral averaging estimate proved in [19]. Fix a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and define $s(\mu, |I|)$ as in (1-2).

Spectral Averaging. *Let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$, A a selfadjoint operator and $0 \le B$ a bounded operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then for any bounded interval I and any $\phi \in \mathcal{H}$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \langle B^{1/2}\chi_I(A+tB)B^{1/2}\phi,\phi\rangle d\mu(t) \le 6\|B\|\|\phi\|^2 s(\mu,|I|).$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We may assume $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ (if $\Omega = [q_-,q_+]^{\mathcal{I}}$, then $\mathbb{P}$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ supported in Ω). By Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} \le \gamma^{-2}C_{\mathrm{fin}}\sum_{j\in J}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}_j}\mathbb{E}\{\langle U_\alpha\chi_I(H(\omega))U_\alpha e_j,e_j\rangle\}$$

Now given $j \in J$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}_j$, put $\phi := U_\alpha^{1/2}e_j$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\{\langle U_\alpha\chi_I(H(\omega))U_\alpha e_j,e_j\rangle\} = \mathbb{E}\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}}\langle U_\alpha^{1/2}\chi_I(H(\omega))U_\alpha^{1/2}\phi,\phi\rangle d\,\mathbb{P}(\omega_\alpha|(\omega_\beta)_{\beta\neq\alpha})\Big\}$$

The inner integral integral may be written as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\langle B^{1/2}\chi_I(A+tB)B^{1/2}\phi,\phi\rangle d\mu(t)$$

for $A = H_1 + \sum_{\beta\neq\alpha}\omega_\beta U_\beta$, $B = U_\alpha$, $t = \omega_\alpha$ and $\mu = \mathbb{P}(\cdot\,|(\omega_\beta)_{\beta\neq\alpha})$. Hence by the spectral averaging theorem,

$$\mathbb{E}\{\langle U_\alpha\chi_I(H(\omega))U_\alpha e_j,e_j\rangle\} \le 6\|U_\alpha\|\|U_\alpha^{1/2}e_j\|^2 s(\mu,|I|) \le 6C_U^2 s(\mu,|I|).$$

The statement follows since by definition, $s(\mu,|I|) \le s(\mathbb{P},|I|)$. □

To prove Theorem 2.3, we use Stollmann's Lemma, more precisely a generalization of it which first appeared in [4]. As we will later need to modify this result to prove Theorem 2.4, we divide the argument in two and start with the following auxiliary lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(\Omega,\mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, with $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{1,\dots,m\}$. Suppose that $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a monotone increasing function and given $a,b \in \mathbb{R}$, define*

$$A := \{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \le a\} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \ge b\}.$$

Now fix $\eta > 0$ and for $1 \le k \le m$, set

$$A_0^\eta := A, \qquad A_k^\eta = A + [0,\eta]e_1 + \dots + [0,\eta]e_k,$$
$$B_0^\eta := B, \qquad B_k^\eta = B - [0,\eta]e_1 - \dots - [0,\eta]e_k.$$

Then for $j \ge 0$, $A_j^\eta \subseteq A_{j+1}^\eta$, $B_j^\eta \subseteq B_{j+1}^\eta$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_m^\eta \setminus A) \le m\cdot s(\mathbb{P},\eta), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(B_m^\eta \setminus B) \le m\cdot s(\mathbb{P},\eta).$$

Proof. We only prove the second bound; the first is similar and already done in [1]. Given $\omega \in B_j^\eta$ we have $\omega = \omega - 0e_{j+1} \in B_{j+1}^\eta$, hence the $B_j^\eta \subseteq B_{j+1}^\eta$. Now

$$\mathbb{P}(B_m^\eta \setminus B) = \mathbb{P}\Big(\bigcup_{j=1}^m (B_j^\eta \setminus B_{j-1}^\eta)\Big) \le \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{P}(B_j^\eta \setminus B_{j-1}^\eta)$$

To estimate this sum, first note that

$$\omega \in B_k^\eta \iff \exists\lambda_i \in [0,\eta] : (\omega_1+\lambda_1,\dots,\omega_k+\lambda_k,\omega_{k+1},\dots,\omega_m) \in B.$$

Now fix $j \in \mathcal{I}$, let $\hat\omega_j = (\omega_i)_{i\neq j} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\setminus\{j\}}$ and put

$$I_{\hat\omega_j} := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : (\omega_1,\dots,\omega_{j-1},x,\omega_{j+1},\dots,\omega_m) \in B_j^\eta \setminus B_{j-1}^\eta\}.$$

We show that $I_{\hat\omega_j}$ is contained in an interval of length η. If $I_{\hat\omega_j} = \emptyset$, this is clear, so suppose $x \in I_{\hat\omega_j}$. Fix $\delta \ge \eta$. If $x-\delta \in I_{\hat\omega_j}$, then $(\omega_1,\dots,\omega_{j-1},x-\delta,\omega_{j+1},\dots,\omega_m) \in B_j^\eta$ and thus $u := (\omega_1+\lambda_1,\dots,\omega_{j-1}+\lambda_{j-1},x-\delta+\lambda_j,\omega_{j+1},\dots,\omega_m) \in B$ for some $\lambda_k \in [0,\eta]$. Hence $\varphi(u) \ge b$. But φ is monotone increasing, so $\varphi(u) \le \varphi(\omega_1+\lambda_1,\dots,\omega_{j-1}+$

$\lambda_{j-1}, x, \omega_{j+1}, \ldots, \omega_m) < b$, since $(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{j-1}, x, \omega_{j+1}, \ldots, \omega_m) \notin B^\eta_{j-1}$. This contradiction shows that $x - \delta \notin I_{\hat{\omega}_j}$ for any $\delta \geq \eta$, in other words, $I_{\hat{\omega}_j}$ is contained in an interval of length η. Thus, if $\mu = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|\hat{\omega}_j)$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}(B^\eta_j \setminus B^\eta_{j-1}) = \int_{\hat{\omega}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\setminus\{j\}}} \mu(I_{\hat{\omega}_j}) d\mathbb{P}_j(\hat{\omega}_j) \leq s(\mu, \eta),$$

where $\mathbb{P}_j$ is the marginal probability induced by $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}\setminus\{j\}}$. By definition, $s(\mu,\eta) \leq s(\mathbb{P},\eta)$, so we obtain the assertion. ☐

We are now ready to prove a first modification of Stollmann's Lemma.

Stollmann's Lemma. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a finite set, $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathbb{P}$ a probability measure on Ω and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ an open interval. Suppose $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a monotone increasing function verifying*

$$\big(\varphi(\omega) - \varphi(\omega - t \cdot \mathbf{1})\big)\chi_I(\varphi(\omega)) \geq t\gamma \cdot \chi_I(\varphi(\omega))$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ and all $t \geq 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \in I\} \leq |\mathcal{I}| \cdot s\Big(\mathbb{P}, \frac{|I|}{\gamma}\Big).$$

Actually, as the proof will show, it suffices to have the weaker condition

$$\big(\varphi(\omega) - \varphi(\omega - \tfrac{|I|}{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{1})\big)\chi_I(\varphi(\omega)) \geq |I| \cdot \chi_I(\varphi(\omega))$$

for some $\gamma > 0$.

Proof. We may assume that $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Assume $I = (a,b)$ and let $\varepsilon = b - a$. Now consider the set

$$A = \{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \leq a\},$$

put $\eta := \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma}$, and for $1 \leq k \leq m$, put

$$A^\eta_0 := A \quad \text{and} \quad A^\eta_k = A + [0,\eta]e_1 + \ldots + [0,\eta]e_k.$$

Then $\{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \in I\} \subseteq A^\eta_m \setminus A$. Indeed, if $\varphi(\omega) \in I$, then by hypothesis

$$\varphi(\omega - \eta \cdot \mathbf{1}) \leq \varphi(\omega) - \gamma\eta = \varphi(\omega) - \varepsilon \leq b - \varepsilon = a,$$

hence $\omega - \eta \cdot \mathbf{1} \in A$. Thus $\omega \in A^\eta_m$. Moreover, $\varphi(\omega) \in I$ implies $\varphi(\omega) > a$ and thus $\omega \notin A$. This proves the claim. The assertion now follows from Lemma 4.1. ☐

To be able to apply Stollmann's Lemma in the setting of Hypotheses (C), we record the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an open convex set and suppose $f : U \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable with $\gamma_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial f(q)}{\partial x_j}$ (resp. $\leq \gamma_2$) for all $q \in U$. Then given $q \in U$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $q - \lambda \cdot \mathbf{1} \in U$, we have $\lambda\gamma_1 \leq f(q) - f(q - \lambda \cdot \mathbf{1})$ (resp. $\leq \lambda\gamma_2$).*

Proof. Given $a, b \in U$, we have $a + t(b-a) \in U$ for any $t \in [0,1]$. Now the map $t \mapsto f(a + t(b-a))$ is continuously differentiable, hence

$$\begin{aligned} f(b) - f(a) &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} f(a + t(b-a))dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{j=1}^d (b_j - a_j)\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(a + t(b-a))dt. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$f(q) - f(q - \lambda \cdot \mathbf{1}) = \lambda \int_0^1 \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}(q - \lambda \cdot \mathbf{1} + t(\lambda \cdot \mathbf{1}))dt.$$

The claim follows using the hypothesis on the sum of partial derivatives at any point. ☐

We shall also need the following variant of Stollmann's Lemma:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a finite set, $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathbb{P}$ a probability measure on Ω and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ an open interval. Suppose $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a monotone decreasing function verifying*

$$\big(\varphi(\omega) - \varphi(\omega - t \cdot \mathbf{1})\big)\chi_I(\varphi(\omega)) \leq -t\gamma \cdot \chi_I(\varphi(\omega))$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ and all $t \geq 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \in I\} \leq |\mathcal{I}| \cdot s\Big(\mathbb{P}, \frac{|I|}{\gamma}\Big).$$

Proof. Assume $I = (a, b)$. The function $\psi = -\varphi$ verifies the hypotheses of Stollmann's Lemma in the interval $I' = (-b, -a)$, hence

$$\mathbb{P}\{\omega : \varphi(\omega) \in I\} = \mathbb{P}\{\omega : \psi(\omega) \in I'\} \leq |\mathcal{I}| \cdot s\Big(\mathbb{P}, \frac{|I'|}{\gamma}\Big). \qquad \square$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.3:

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Given $\omega \in \Omega$, let $\{\varphi_n(\omega)\}$ be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of $H(\omega)$ with corresponding eigenvalues $\lambda_n(\omega)$. Then by the functional calculus

$$\langle \varphi_n(\omega), \chi_I(H(\omega))\varphi_n(\omega)\rangle = \chi_I(\lambda_n(\omega))$$

So using Hypothesis (C).4, we get

$$\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))] = \sum_n \langle \varphi_n(\omega), \chi_I(H(\omega))\varphi_n(\omega)\rangle = \sum_{n \leq K} \chi_I(\lambda_n(\omega)).$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} = \sum_{n \leq K} \mathbb{E}\{\chi_I(\lambda_n(\omega))\} = \sum_{n \leq K} \mathbb{P}\{\lambda_n(\omega) \in I\}.$$

Now assume Hypothesis (C).6.a holds. By the min-max principle we get that for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $\lambda_n(\omega)$ are monotone increasing and verify

$$\lambda_n(\omega) \geq \lambda_n(\omega - t \cdot \mathbf{1}) + t\gamma$$

It follows from Stollmann's lemma that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\lambda_n(\omega) \in I\} \leq |\mathcal{I}| \cdot s\Big(\mathbb{P}, \frac{|I|}{\gamma}\Big),$$

as asserted. If (C).6.b holds instead, then by Lemma 4.2, (C).6.a. holds too and we get the assertion. If (C).6.c holds instead, we do a similar reasoning using Lemma 4.3 instead of Stollmann's lemma. Finally, if (C).6.d holds instead, then by Lemma 4.2, (C).6.c holds and we get the assertion. $\square$

We finally prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. The first trick is to identify Ω with $\tilde{\Omega} = [v_-, v_+]^{\mathcal{I}}$, where $v_- := \ln q_-$ and $v_+ := \ln q_+$. This idea was used before in the Wegner estimate of the paper [15], where a quantum graph with random edge length was considered. In other words, instead of considering the random variables $(\omega_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$, we consider the variables $(v_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}}$ where $v_\alpha := \ln \omega_\alpha$. Since the distribution of these variables is given for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbb{P}\{\omega : \ln \omega_\alpha \leq a\} = \mu_\alpha(0, e^a] = \tilde{\mu}_\alpha(-\infty, a],$$

where $\tilde{\mu}_\alpha(a, b) := \mu_\alpha(e^a, e^b)$, this identification induces the measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} := \otimes_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{\mu}_\alpha$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$.

We now suppose that (2-1) holds with $\zeta > 0$ and fix $u \in \mathcal{D}$. Given $v \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and $t \geq 0$, we note that if there exists $a(u) \geq 0$ and $b_\alpha(u) \geq 0$ such that (2-1) holds, then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle (H \circ \exp)(v + t \cdot \mathbf{1})u, u\rangle &= -a(u) + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} e^{\zeta(v_\alpha + t)} b_\alpha(u)\\ &= -a(u) + e^{\zeta t}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} e^{\zeta v_\alpha} b_\alpha(u) \geq e^{\zeta t}\langle (H\circ\exp)(v)u,u\rangle\end{aligned}$$

since $-a(u) \geq -e^{\zeta t}a(u)$. Thus, by the min-max principle we get for any eigenvalue

$$\lambda_n(v + t\cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq e^{\zeta t}\lambda_n(v). \tag{4-1}$$

Moreover, $\lambda_n(v)$ is monotone increasing in v since $b_\alpha(u) \geq 0$ for any u. We thus need the following variation of Stollmann's Lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a finite set, $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathbb{P}$ a probability measure on Ω and $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ an open interval. Suppose $\varphi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a monotone increasing function satisfying*

$$\big(\varphi(q + t\cdot\mathbf{1}) - \varphi(q)\big)\chi_I(\varphi(q)) \geq \gamma(e^{\zeta t} - 1)\cdot\chi_I(\varphi(q)) \tag{4-2}$$

for some $\zeta > 0$, $\gamma > 0$ and all $t \geq 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\{q : \varphi(q) \in I\} \leq |\mathcal{I}| \cdot s\Big(\mathbb{P}, \frac{1}{\zeta}\ln\big(1 + \frac{|I|}{\gamma}\big)\Big).$$

This bound is also true if φ is monotone decreasing and satisfies

$$\big(\varphi(q) - \varphi(q - t\cdot\mathbf{1})\big)\chi_I(\varphi(q)) \leq \gamma(1 - e^{\zeta t})\cdot\chi_I(\varphi(q)). \tag{4-3}$$

Given this, we first continue the proof of Theorem 2.4, then we prove Lemma 4.4. We note that if $\lambda_n(v) \in I$, then $\lambda_n(v) \geq E_1 > 0$. Hence it follows from (4-1) that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\lambda_n(v + t\cdot\mathbf{1}) - \lambda_n(v)\big)\chi_I(\lambda_n(v)) &\geq \big(e^{\zeta t}\lambda_n(v) - \lambda_n(v)\big)\chi_I(\lambda_n(v))\\ &\geq (e^{\zeta t} - 1)E_1\chi_I(\lambda_n(v)).\end{aligned}$$

Reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 2.3 and using Lemma 4.4, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H\circ\exp(v))]\}\\ &= \sum_{n\leq K}\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\{\lambda_n(v) \in I\}\\ &\leq K\cdot|\mathcal{I}|\cdot\max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} s\Big(\tilde{\mu}_\alpha, \frac{1}{\zeta}\ln\big(1 + \frac{|I|}{E_1}\big)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

We finally estimate this term. Since $\operatorname{supp}\tilde{\mu}_\alpha = [v_-, v_+]$, it suffices to consider intervals $(a, a+\varepsilon)$ with $a \leq v_+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. By definition, we have $\tilde{\mu}_\alpha(a, a+\varepsilon) = \mu_\alpha(e^a, e^{a+\varepsilon})$. Since $e^{a+\varepsilon} - e^a = e^a(e^\varepsilon - 1) \leq q_+(e^\varepsilon - 1)$, we get

$$s(\tilde{\mu}_\alpha, \varepsilon) \leq s(\mu_\alpha, q_+(e^\varepsilon - 1)).$$

Hence, for $\varepsilon := \frac{1}{\zeta}\ln\big(1 + \frac{|I|}{E_1}\big)$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}\{\mathrm{tr}[\chi_I(H(\omega))]\} \leq K\cdot|\mathcal{I}|\cdot\max_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} s\Big(\mu_\alpha, q_+\Big(\big(1 + \frac{|I|}{E_1}\big)^{\frac{1}{\zeta}} - 1\Big)\Big),$$

which proves the claim in this case.

Suppose now that $\zeta < 0$ and put $\theta := -\zeta > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle (H\circ\exp)(v)u, u\rangle &= -a(u) + \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} e^{-\theta v_\alpha} b_\alpha(u)\\ &= -a(u) + e^{-\theta t}\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}} e^{-\theta(v_\alpha - t)} b_\alpha(u) \leq e^{-\theta t}\langle (H\circ\exp)(v - t\cdot\mathbf{1})u, u\rangle\end{aligned}$$

since $-a(u) \leq -e^{-\theta t}a(u)$, so that for any eigenvalue,

$$\lambda_n(v) \leq e^{-\theta t}\lambda_n(v - t \cdot \mathbf{1}),$$

and thus, noting that $(1 - e^{\theta}t) \leq 0$ and $E_1 \geq 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\lambda_n(v) - \lambda_n(v - t \cdot \mathbf{1})\big)\chi_I(\lambda_n(v)) &\leq \big(\lambda_n(v) - e^{\theta t}\lambda_n(v)\big)\chi_I(\lambda_n(v)) \\ &\leq (1 - e^{\theta t})E_1\chi_I(\lambda_n(v)).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $\lambda_n(v)$ is monotone decreasing. The claim thus follows again from Lemma 4.4 □

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Let $m = |\mathcal{I}|$, assume $I = (a, b)$ and let $\varepsilon = b - a$, $\eta := \frac{1}{\zeta}\ln(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\gamma})$. Suppose first that φ is monotone increasing and satisfies (4-2). Consider the set

$$B = \{q : \varphi(q) \geq b\}$$

and put

$$B_0^\eta := B, \qquad B_k^\eta = B - [0, \eta]e_1 - \ldots - [0, \eta]e_k.$$

Then $\{q : \varphi(q) \in I\} \subseteq B_m^\varepsilon \setminus B$. Indeed, if $\varphi(q) \in I$, then by hypothesis

$$\varphi(q + \eta \cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq \varphi(q) + \gamma(e^{\zeta\eta} - 1) = \varphi(q) + \varepsilon \geq a + \varepsilon = b,$$

hence $q + \eta \cdot \mathbf{1} \in B$. Thus $q \in B_m^\eta$. Moreover, $\varphi(q) \in I$ implies $\varphi(q) < b$ and thus $q \notin B$. This proves the claim. The assertion now follows from Lemma 4.1.

Now suppose φ is monotone decreasing, satisfies (4-3). Let $\psi(q) := -\varphi(q)$ and put

$$A = \{q : \psi(q) \leq -b\},$$

$$A_0^\eta := A, \qquad A_k^\eta = A + [0, \eta]e_1 + \ldots + [0, \eta]e_k.$$

Then $\{q : \varphi(q) \in I\} \subseteq A_m^\eta \setminus A$. Indeed, if $\varphi(q) \in I$, then by hypothesis

$$\varphi(q - \eta \cdot \mathbf{1}) \geq \varphi(q) - \gamma(1 - e^{\zeta\eta}) = \varphi(q) + \varepsilon \geq a + \varepsilon = b,$$

hence

$$\psi(q - \eta \cdot \mathbf{1}) \leq -b$$

and $q - \eta \cdot \mathbf{1} \in A$. Thus $q \in A_m^\eta$. Moreover, $\varphi(q) \in I$ implies $\varphi(q) < b$, i.e. $\psi(q) > -b$ and thus $q \notin A$. This proves the claim. The assertion now follows Lemma 4.1 for the monotone increasing function ψ. □

Acknowledgements. This work is part of my PhD thesis, supervised by Professors Anne Boutet de Monvel and Victor Chulaevsky. I am very thankful for their encouragement, for their suggestions to improve this text, and for pointing out to me the papers [19] and [20]. I also thank Professor Konstantin Pankrashkin for clarifying discussions on [11].

References

1. A. Boutet de Monvel, V. Chulaevsky, P. Stollmann, and Y. Suhov, *Wegner-type Bounds for a Multi-particle Continuous Anderson Model with an Alloy-type External Potential*, J. Stat. Phys. **138** (2010), 553–566.
2. A. Boutet de Monvel, D. Lenz, and P. Stollmann, *An uncertainty principle, Wegner estimates and localization near fluctuation boundaries*, Math. Z. **269** (2011), 663–670.
3. R. Carmona and J. Lacroix, *Spectral Theory of Random Schrödinger Operators*, Birkhäuser, 1990.
4. V. Chulaevsky, *A Wegner-type Estimate for Correlated Potentials*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **11** (2008), 117–129.
5. V. Chulaevsky and Y. Suhov, *Wegner Bounds for a Two-Particle Tight Binding Model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **283** (2008), 479–489.
6. J-M. Combes, P. Hislop, and F. Klopp, *An optimal Wegner estimate and its application to the global continuity of the integrated density of states for random Schrödinger operators*, Duke Math. J. **140** (2007), 469–498.
7. P. Hislop and F. Klopp, *The integrated density of states for some random operators with nonsign definite potentials*, J. Funct. Anal. **195** (2002), no. 1, 12–47.

8. W. Kirsch, *An invitation to random Schrödinger operators*, Random Schrödinger operators, Soc. Math. France, 2008, pp. 1–119.
9. ———, *A Wegner estimate for multi-particle random Hamiltonians*, Zh. Mat. Fiz. Anal. Geom. **4** (2008), no. 1, 121–127, 203.
10. F. Klopp, *Localization for some continuous random Schrödinger operators*, Comm. Math. Phys. **167** (1995), no. 3, 553–569.
11. F. Klopp and K. Pankrashkin, *Localization on Quantum Graphs with Random Edge Lengths*, Letters in Mathematical Physics **87** (2009), 99–114.
12. F. Klopp and H. Zenk, *The integrated density of states for an interacting multiparticle homogeneous model and applications to the Anderson model*, Adv. Math. Phys. (2009), Art. ID 679827, 15.
13. H. Krüger, *Localization for random operators with non-monotone potentials with exponentially decaying correlations*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **13** (2012), no. 3, 543–598.
14. P. Kuchment, *Quantum graphs I. Some basic structures*, Waves Random Media **14** (2004), no. 1, S107–S128.
15. D. Lenz, N. Peyerimhoff, O. Post, and I. Veselic, *Continuity of the integrated density of states on random length metric graphs*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **12** (2009), 219–254.
16. M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics IV: Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.
17. M. Sabri, *Anderson localization for a multi-particle quantum graph*, preprint arXiv: 1201.6247v2.
18. P. Stollmann, *Caught by Disorder: Bound States in Random Media*, Progress in Mathematical Physics, vol. 20, Birkhäuser, 2001.
19. ———, *From Uncertainty Principles to Wegner Estimates*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **13** (2010), 145–157.
20. ———, *Erratum to: From Uncertainty Principles to Wegner Estimates*, preprint arXiv: 1210.4288.
21. I. Veselić, *Wegner estimates for sign-changing single site potentials*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **13** (2010), 299–313.
22. I. Veselić, *Wegner estimate for discrete alloy-type models*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **11** (2010), no. 5, 991–1005.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS DIDEROT PARIS 7, 175 RUE DU CHEVALERET, 75013, PARIS, FRANCE
E-mail address: `sabri@math.jussieu.fr`